

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Application

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-30 were pending.

Independent claims 1, 11, 18 and 29 have been amended by the incorporation of the recitations of dependent claim 30. Claim 30 has therefore been canceled. No claims have been added. Hence, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-29 remain pending for examination.

Claims 1-2, 11-12 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 5,913,078 to Kimura et al. ("Kimura") in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,243 to Tullis ("Tullis"). Claims 3-5, 7-10, 13-17, 19-25 and 27-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. in view of Tullis, and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,241 to Clapper ("Clapper"). Claims 6 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. in view of Tullis, and further in view of Clapper, and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,401,029 to Kubota et al. ("Kubota").

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the amended application in light of the amendments and remarks below.

Amendments

Claims 1, 11, 18 and 29

Claims 1, 11, 18 and 29 have been amended to incorporate recitations previously found in original claim 30. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by these amendments.

Remarks

Independent claims 1, 11, 18 and 29

Independent claims 1, 11, 18 and 29 stand rejected as being obvious over Kimura in view of Tullis. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 18 and 29 to include recitations previously found in now canceled claim 30. Claim 30 was rejected in the Office Action as being obvious over Kimura in view of Tullis, and further in view of Clapper. To the extent this prior rejection of claim 30 may now be applied to claims 1, 11, 18 and 29, Applicant respectfully traverses any such rejection, at least because Kimura, Tullis and Clapper do not teach or suggest the recitations previously found in claim 30, and now incorporated into claims 1, 11, 18 and 29; nor have such recitations been shown to have been known in the art at the time of the invention.

Specifically, Kimura, Tullis and Clapper do not teach or suggest the central monitor plotting a representation of the location on a map. The Office Action, in regards to now canceled claim 30, cites Clapper, col. 5, ll. 33-35 as teaching or suggesting such a recitation. However, this portion of Clapper merely discusses the user device displaying a map, not a central monitor which, as recited in claims 1, 11, 18 and 29 is remote from the user device. While Tullis may discuss a central monitor, it does not teach or suggest such central monitor displaying a map as recited in claims 1, 11, 18 and 29.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kimura, Tullis and Clapper do not teach or suggest all of the recitations of claims 1, 11, 18 and 29. Consequently, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established in regard to those claims. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the §103 rejections of these claims.

Dependent claim 9

Claim 9 stands rejected as being obvious over Kimura in view of Tullis, and further in view of Clapper. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Kimura, Tullis and Clapper do not teach or suggest all of the recitations of claim 9, nor have such recitations been shown to have been known in the art at the time of the invention.

Claim 9 recites “wherein the map is a topological map.” Neither Kimura nor Clapper even mention topological map. The Office Action cites column 6, lines 55-59 of Clapper as teaching or suggesting these recitations. However, this portion of Clapper only recites a general “map mode” and does not mention a topological map. Even more specifically, this portion of Clapper discusses calculating of a travel vector in regards to the map mode. As is known in the art, topological maps may lack scale and/or realistic orientation of landmarks. As such, a “calculated” travel vector will likely have no meaning with respect to a topological map. Thus, at least this portion of Clapper may even teach away from providing a topological map.

Because Kimura, Tullis and Clapper do not teach or suggest “wherein the map is a topological map[,]” Kimura, Tullis and Clapper do not teach all of the recitations of claim 9. Because Kimura, Tullis and Clapper do not teach or suggest all of the recitations of claim 9, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of this claim. Claim 9 also depends, either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least this additional reason.

Dependent Claims 2-8, 10, 12-17, 19-28

Claims 2-8, 10, 12-17, 19-28 each depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of claim 1, 11, or 18, and are therefore believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejections of these claims.

CONCLUSION


For at least all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/681,530
Amdt. dated January 25, 2008
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2621

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew T. Sarles".

Matthew T. Sarles
Reg. No. 58,696

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
MTS:cmb

61176893 v1